

40834AA
The Family

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL DIVORCE REFORM LEAGUE

(FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE FAMILY)

FOR THE YEAR
ENDING DECEMBER 31
1896



T H E

National Divorce Reform League

President.

Rt. Rev. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D.D., LL.D., Boston.

Vice-Presidents.

Hon. NATHANIEL SHIPMAN, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.

Pres. SETH LOW, LL.D., New York.

Prof. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., Andover.

Corresponding Secretary.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

Recording Secretary.

Rev. C. H. SPALDING, Boston.

Treasurer.

WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, Esq., 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston.

Executive Committee.

Prof. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., Andover.

Pres. M. H. BUCKHAM, D.D., Burlington, Vt.

Hon. SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.

Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D.D., Cambridge.

Prof. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph.D., Newton Centre.

Rev. JAMES DENORMANDIE, Roxbury.

Prof. G. D. B. PEPPER, D.D., Waterville, Me.

Rev. DANIEL MERRIMAN, D.D., Worcester.

Hon. CHARLES C. BURR, Auburndale.

EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston.

FRANK GAYLORD COOK, Esq., Cambridge.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

REPORT

OF THE

National Divorce Reform League

(For the Improvement of the Family)

FOR THE

YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1896.

BOSTON :

THE EVERETT PRESS COMPANY, PRINTERS,

47 FRANKLIN STREET,

1897.

Prefatory Notes.

1. The Report of the Corresponding Secretary for 1895 reviewed an important social and political movement of the past fifteen years, and will repay careful reading. It was reprinted in separate form for wider circulation, and copies can be obtained of the Secretary.

2. Reports of years since 1890, and a few only of our special issues, can be sent freely to applicants.

3. The Report of the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, LL.D, Commissioner of Labor, on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and Europe, can be had on application addressed to the Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

4. The League is the only society in the country immediately devoted to the Family. Its comprehensive and successful work, therefore, claims, even amid other urgent calls for money, a small place, at least, in your charities. It needs double its present income. Our support necessarily comes from those who can appreciate thorough fundamental work. CONTRIBUTIONS SENT EARLY IN THE YEAR, OR ENCOURAGEMENT GIVEN FOR DONATIONS LATER, HAVE SPECIAL VALUE.

5. ASSOCIATE ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP is invited. This is freely granted to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of *five dollars* for the year. Such persons vote in our meetings, and receive all our publications. *If you cannot be a larger contributor, will you not send your request for associate membership, with the fee, and thus share in this important work?*

6. The Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict, 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, will gratefully acknowledge all contributions sent to him.

7. Correspondence relating to the work of the League should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, REV. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., AUBURNDALÉ, MASS. Contributions may also be sent directly to him.

Minutes.

The seventeenth annual meeting of the National Divorce Reform League, duly called, was held at the Diocesan House, Boston, Jan. 19, 1897, at 2.30 P.M., the President, Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, being in the Chair. Prayer was offered by Professor George Harris. The report of the Treasurer, William G. Benedict, was read and ordered to be placed on file, and was also referred to William B. Herrick as Auditor.

In the absence of the Recording Secretary, William H. Cobb was chosen *pro tempore*. The Corresponding Secretary read the main portions of his annual report. Voted to accept the report, and print it with such modifications as the Corresponding Secretary may deem proper.

The report of the Executive Committee was presented by Professor Harris. Voted to accept the report and place it on file. The recommendations of the report were then discussed.

Voted that the Corresponding Secretary be authorized to take more time this year than formerly for securing increased support for the League. Voted that the Executive Committee select three from their number to suggest a new name for the League, and any other amendments to the Constitution which they may think desirable.

Voted that the Corresponding Secretary be authorized to make such use as he may choose of the Executive Committee's report.

The officers of the past year were all re-elected, as follows: —

President, Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D.

Vice-Presidents, Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D., Pres. Seth Low, LL.D., Prof. George Harris, D.D.

Corresponding Secretary, Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D.

Recording Secretary, Rev. C. H. Spalding.

Treasurer, Mr. William G. Benedict.

Executive Committee, Prof. George Harris, D.D.; President M. H. Buckham, D.D.; Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D.; Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D.; Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D.; Rev. James De Normandie; Prof. G. D. B. Pepper, D.D.; Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D.; Hon. Charles C. Burr; Mr. Everett O. Fisk; Mr. Frank Gaylord Cook; Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D.

The minutes were read and approved, after which the meeting was dissolved.

WILLIAM H. COBB,

Recording Secretary pro tempore.

From the Report of the Executive Committee.

The receipts for 1896 are \$424 less than for 1895. The whole amount now due on the salary of the Secretary (all other bills having been paid) is \$698. It is of first importance that the annual income be increased. The income for 1897 should be at least \$3,200, in order to extinguish the debt and to cover the expenses of the year, if restricted to the smallest possible sum. The Committee recommend that the Secretary be authorized to take more time this year than formerly for securing increased financial support for the League. The officers and members can aid him in this work by giving names of persons, with letters of introduction, and by securing contributions themselves. They can also open the way for addresses by the Secretary before societies, clubs, and churches.

The Committee recommend a change in the name of the League. The present name seems to limit the scope of our work. Although the Constitution defines our objects more widely, yet a society is known by its name. Some are not interested as they would be if the name suggested the interests of the Family. When the New England Divorce Reform League was organized the immediate object was improved legislation and sentiment concerning Marriage and Divorce. After it became the National Divorce Reform League that object was still paramount. That work has now been advanced so far, and so much of it is now awaiting the action of the State Commissions on Uniformity and other civic agencies, that the League at present is able to attend more fully to those important interests that affect the Family and Home beyond the immediate subjects of Marriage and Divorce — subjects which have necessarily engaged much of our attention for several years and will do so in the future.

Ten or twelve years ago a proposition to change the name of the League was regarded as premature, although several members of the Committee were emphatically in favor of a more comprehensive designation. The time has now come, in our judgment, when the reasons for a change predominate. The Society is incorporated under the laws of the State of Connecticut. A petition should be presented to the proper authority in that State for the substitution of some other name for that which was taken at the time of incorporation.

Our Constitution provides for amendment at the annual meeting, after due notice of such amendment in the call of the meeting. We recommend that notice of such amendment be given in the call of the next annual meeting, and that a committee be appointed to-day to propose a suitable name and amendments to the Constitution.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE HARRIS,

Chairman.

Boston, Jan. 19, 1897.

[Professor Harris, President Buckham, and Dr. Dike were made the special committee on the change of name and Constitution. Suggestions, especially of a suitable name for the organization, are invited by this committee.]

Report of Corresponding Secretary.

Our report for 1895 included a review of the fifteen years of the League which had then been completed. A special edition was printed for future use, and copies can be supplied to those who may ask for them. It will be found useful for the better understanding of the subjects of the present report and for the survey of the general movement.

The prolonged financial depression, the unusual absorption of the public mind in the topics brought forward by the last presidential election, and the fact that few legislatures were in session in the past year have combined to make 1896 one of the most difficult years in which to prosecute our work. But the year has had its peculiarly valuable achievements, especially in the marked tendency of several important lines of educational work to direct public thought to the Home.

CHANGE OF NAME.

Before giving account of the work of the year, let me call the attention of the reader to the report of the Executive Committee on a change in the name of the League, to which my own report may refer again at the end. This subject came up spontaneously in the Committee meeting held a week ago, and wholly unexpectedly to the Secretary, whose work and correspondence in recent years have brought increasing appeals for this step. It should be noted here that our Constitution already expressly states our object to be "the improvement in public sentiment and legislation in *the institution of the Family*," and our work has been correspondingly broad. But with some word like *Family* or *Home* in the *name of our society* there would be a great popular and practical gain. Though the long and frequent use of the word *Home* by various societies makes our own selection of a new name difficult, it is hoped that a good one can be found for the one organization in the country that more than any other is devoted to the interests of Family and Home. Suggestions will be extremely welcome.

STATE LEGISLATION.

Very few legislatures of States held sessions in 1896, and almost nothing of importance was done in regard to the Family. Private hearings in Divorce suits have become so frequent occasions of evil in New York that an effort was made by some of her citizens to forbid or restrict this method of trial, as has been done in other States, but the bill for the purpose failed to become a law.

The new State of Utah made legitimate all children of polygamous marriages born prior to Jan. 4, 1896. The Edmunds-Tucker Act had annulled all Territorial laws providing for inheritance by children of illegitimate parents. The qualification in the new statute seems to show that it is not intended to become an encouragement to polygamy hereafter.

Congress has enacted a very careful and full Marriage law for the District of Columbia, making in it particular regulations for the marriage of foreigners, so that their own national rules are respected in the administration of our local laws.

A UNIFORM TERRITORIAL LAW.

The Territories in their early legislation naturally made the conditions of Divorce extremely easy, to meet the supposed necessities of frontier life. These lax regulations soon became a source of serious mischief and have often been retained, as in the Dakotas, to become a blemish upon the statute-books of the States formed from the Territories.

For years we have in various ways labored to awaken sufficient interest in the subject, both in Congress and elsewhere, to secure a reform of these abuses. About ten years ago, acting under the spur of the growth of Polygamy in Utah, Congress put the Marriage laws of the Territories in very good condition, but has been slow to see the need of dealing with Divorce. Before the last Congress met we called the attention of some leading members of Congress to the subject, and soon after the opening of the sessions opportunity for a practicable reform presented itself. Two members of the House of Representatives proposed, as others have done in former congresses, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enable Congress to enact uniform laws on the subject of Divorce, not knowing that this method of securing uniformity has by common consent been laid aside until the State Commissions on Uniformity could work out their part of the problem; if, indeed, they should not be able to do all that can be done.

One of these gentlemen, the Hon. F. H. Gillett, a member from Massachusetts, applied to us for information. The suggestion was made that, instead of pressing his measure, he would do a better service now by the introduction of some stricter regulations for the Territories, especially on account of the scandals in Oklahoma. Mr. Gillett welcomed the suggestion with approval and acted upon it. Dr. W. F. Crafts, of the National Bureau of Reforms in Washington, soon afterwards sent me a bill which, after consultation with a judge of the District of Columbia, he prepared for the same object, asking advice. I suggested that it adopt the period of residence recommended by

the Commissioners on Uniformity. This was done, and in committee or previously it was improved in form. Mr. Gillett and others, with the aid of Dr. Crafts, looked after the measure and it became a law, by the approval of the President, May 25, 1896. As enacted it reads as follows : —

“ No Divorce shall be granted in any Territory for any cause unless the party applying for Divorce shall have resided continuously in the Territory for one year next preceding the application.”

If the one or two States which are still below this moderate standard of the Commissioners would adopt this statute, one great occasion of scandal would be removed. Migrations for Divorce, now probably growing less each year, would be removed. Of course, other ax statutes, and especially administration under them, and even under laws fairly good in themselves, need attention.

UNIFORM STATE LEGISLATION.

Twenty-nine States and one Territory are now represented by their Commissions on Uniform Legislation. The last annual conference of the Commissioners was so busy with the completion of some elaborate plans for uniformity on subjects of commercial importance that the full consideration of Marriage and Divorce was deferred until the next meeting. Probably Divorce will then be a leading topic, as a bill is being drafted “ to secure uniformity with regard to some branches of the subject.”

The Commissions, however, made the following recommendations, embodying in part their earlier ones: That some ceremony, formality, written evidence, signed by the parties and attested by one or more witnesses, be required in all marriages; that in so-called common-law marriages this evidence be filed in an appropriate office within ninety days, and a failure to do so be made a misdemeanor, and if this be not done, or the marriage be not subsequently ratified, then neither party shall have any right or interest in the property of the other; that stringent provision be made for the immediate record of all marriages; and that the age of consent to marriage should be raised to eighteen for the male and fifteen for the female.

They also renew their former recommendation of a strict law providing that no divorce be granted unless the defendant be domiciled, at the time the cause of the action arose, in the State where the divorce is to be granted, or have been served with process within that State, or shall have voluntarily appeared in such action. They further recommend the liberty of re-marriage to both parties to the action after a divorce. Many will regret the last recommendation, though it may have seemed necessary to concede the point for the sake of uniformity in other things.

The Commissioners in conference earnestly urge legislators, as well as their own members, to introduce the various bills on Uniformity, which they have carefully prepared, into their own State legislatures. It is hoped that all good citizens who deplore the evils of the present conflicting laws will aid in this work. The press should make its influence felt. We expect another year to be able to report much greater progress on this subject of Uniform Legislation, which does not advance as rapidly as it would if the Commissioners did not have to work without pay and without more decided expressions of public interest in their important task.

FOREIGN LEGISLATION.

I am unable to say whether that part of the new code of Japan introducing substantially the Western system of Family Law, following the German more closely than any other, has yet been promulgated. Its enforcement was suspended for a time through some doubt whether the country is yet prepared for this great change.

Germany enacted in July a Uniform Civil Code which is the result of the work of her ablest jurists for twenty years, but it will not go into effect until Jan. 1, 1900. The published code has only recently reached this country, so that we are unable to give the points of the Uniform Divorce law, which it establishes for the entire Empire, and which completes the German system of a uniform Family law. While it is said to allow Divorce for "profound disturbance of the matrimonial relation" by "the dishonorable or immoral conduct of either party," it may be doubted if this will be in practical effect anything nearly as mischievous as similar provisions that formerly were found in American law proved to be; for the more careful administration of Divorce law in Europe than in our country makes such general grounds of Divorce there comparatively safe. It has been said that this imperial code restricts Divorce to fewer causes than formerly existed in most of the German States. Certainly its adherence to Teutonic principles of Family law will make its careful study useful to us in the study of our own national problems.

DIVORCE STATISTICS.

The last report of the Division of Vital Statistics of the State Department of Michigan contains an urgent plea for the registration of Divorces in that State, their return to the Department, and publication with other vital statistics. A letter of your Secretary is printed in that report asking that this be done and setting forth the reasons for it, which are those he laid before the International Statistical Institute in 1892, at the request of the late President Walker. I have just learned that a bill has been introduced to secure this object. We urge

every State, both for scientific and practical reasons, to make its statistics of Births, Marriages, and Divorces as complete as practicable. No more important facts affecting the public welfare can be collected than those which relate to the most fundamental of all social institutions. Our next paragraph will illustrate this.

THE BIRTH-RATE.

The stationary condition of population in France has, it is well known, awakened deep concern in the minds of many French publicists. The subject has at times attracted serious attention in this country, especially in the older States. The vital statistics of Michigan for the year 1894, about to be published, take up the subject for that State in a thoroughly scientific way. Dr. C. L. Wilbur, of the Department of State, shows in the report that there has been a great decline in the number of children born to each mother in twenty years, as noted by five-year periods, being from 3.6 to 3.0 in case of the native-born mother, and from 5.8 to 5.1 with the foreign-born mother. And he then says, "According to this comparison the fecundity of native marriages in Michigan has declined until it is about the same as that of France, which is characterized by a nearly stationary population. It is difficult to decide whether the native-born population of Michigan has ceased to increase, is actually decreasing, or is still increasing at a very low rate of annual increase." Dr. Wilbur closes the study with an extract from one of the earlier papers published by the League, in which the facts for Massachusetts were presented, and he adds that this extract well expresses "the ultimate consequences of this condition of affairs."

During the year there has been considerable alarm shown over some public disclosures regarding gross forms of licentiousness, and a good deal of denunciation has followed from the pulpit and religious press. The daily press also has felt compelled to protest against these evils, in the interests of public morals. No one who knows much of our work will forget that from the first we have called attention to this class of evils which corrupt the physical basis of the Family as well as poison individual life. If wisely spoken,—and wisdom is extremely important on this delicate and difficult subject,—much good can be done to correct and remove the evils of licentiousness. But the clergy and religious writers do well to remember that certain evils that affect the so-called better classes themselves, which occasion in part this low birth-rate and encourage the first steps toward the brothel, are also within the reach of their influence. A more careful study of the domestic sources of these vices, and the call to reform among those whose social standing and general good repute should lead us to expect would most easily yield to better influences, may well be added to

those denunciations of notorious vice which are easily made, but often of little practical value. Social reform of all kinds goes on best where efforts to remove the vices of the degraded classes proceed from those who are as much in earnest about the less notorious vices of reputedly good people, whose virtues should make their reform the easier task.

THE HOME AND CRIME.

The public and philanthropists are becoming more aware of the need of studying the influence of the bad Home in the creation of criminal conditions and as a direct cause of crime itself. At one of the annual meetings of the National Prison Reform Association, I asked several persons most expert in the subject their individual opinions regarding the cause of crime. The question was put to each separately and fairly. Almost invariably the answer was given in these words: "Bad homes and Heredity." I happened to speak of this lately where a prominent official of the Prison Reform Association was present. At the close of the address, he added his own opinion in support of the statement, and asked me to prepare a paper on the subject for their next meeting. A former secretary of that society had asked the same many years ago. I assented at that time on condition that data for the paper should be put in my hands. But that could not then be supplied. I doubt if much can be readily found now. Such work as has been already done by really scientific statisticians, especially when the attempt has been made to carry along at the same time an inquiry for all the leading causes for a given crime instead of looking only for some one of them, goes to confirm this opinion regarding the relation of the Home to crime. The great fault of some of our best statistical inquiries into the relations of Intemperance to crime is that legislatures and others direct their statistical inquiries to be made regarding a single cause at a time, instead of trying to search out all the contributing causes in the same inquiry and thus seeing them in their proportions to each other and to the whole. The saloon is bad enough, but it is a great practical mistake to charge to it all social vice and the evils of bad Homes. We must ask religious clubs and other assemblies that are fond of hearing about the reform of the criminal—a most important work—to give proper attention to the sources of crime and the way men become criminals. To reduce the supply is as valuable reformatory work as the effort to save the actual criminal.

TEMPERANCE AND THE HOME.

The investigation which I was asked to make for the Committee of Fifty upon the Liquor Problem has been practically completed. Its object was twofold: first, to find out just what provision is actually

made by the various organizations and publishing-societies of the churches and the non-ecclesiastical temperance societies for instruction in temperance within the Home itself; and secondly, to learn what, in the judgment of educators and other competent authorities, could be reasonably expected of the Home.

This brief report is at the disposal of that committee, and we may obtain permission to reprint it for our use. But I am now free to give some of its results here. When their attention is once fairly given to the subject, probably most thoughtful persons would agree that Dr. Chickering did not greatly exaggerate when he said many years ago, in a little tract on Parental Responsibility: "If we should say that parents as such are more responsible in this matter than any and all others, it might not be far from the truth." Yet the National Temperance Society has for Home use only a Family pledge and a few tracts, mostly on the hereditary effects of alcohol. The officials of the Publication Houses of two of the largest Christian bodies, the Baptists and the Methodists, write that they depend on the National Temperance Society for their supplies of temperance literature of this kind, apparently unaware how little there is of it.

The resolutions or other deliverances of the national assemblies of our leading Christian denominations sometimes mention temperance instruction in the Home, but this is done infrequently and then almost always in a purely perfunctory manner, apparently to round out a sentence or as a conventional tribute to the Home. An official letter of the Secretary of the Permanent Committee of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church North, which appeared in the *New York Observer* of September 3, 1896, is so remarkable an illustration of the neglect of the Home that reference is made to it. This letter shows great earnestness. But in a careful enumeration of the seven or eight ways in which it shows that temperance work should be done, not the slightest mention is made of work in the Home. These are typical illustrations to which there are one or two exceptions. But even the exceptions are scarcely more than beginnings.

Let me now show the attitude of discerning teachers of ethics by a quotation from the letter of a single one of their number. It is highly suggestive in various directions. Prof. J. D. Hyslop, of Columbia University, says, among other things:—

"The present almost universal tendency is to deal with the problem of Intemperance without any reference either to the Family or to the individual inebriate. . . . It seems that we should first have to teach mankind that the Family is the centre from which to view all modern progress; and having made this their habitual way of thinking, we can impress the public with the fact that the Temperance problem has a right to treatment from a point within the Family." After saying that

the Family is generally left out of account in dealing with ethical and social questions, and that the strong egoistic impulses of our social life must find correction in the use of the Family, he adds: "The Family, therefore, being the centre from which the whole problem of ethical and social action has to be considered, I do not see why some method of instruction could not be devised which would render a dependence upon the public school and other foreign agencies unnecessary, or at least regard them as merely secondary instruments to the desired end. I question whether instruction in the Family will do all that is desired, and still more I question the final efficiency of methods aiming at a restriction or prevention of the supply of drink. . . . I should think, from *a priori* considerations alone, that it would be as easy to apply some method of instruction in the Home as it is in the school or the church."

Wherever I have spoken on the Home and Temperance there has been a hearty response to the position taken regarding the need of more temperance work within the Home itself through the use of its own resources. It will probably do good to have these deficiencies in the work of churches and temperance societies pointed out. Of course, something is done, and in some quarters more than others, but in the absorption of the public attention in the defences against the liquor habit by law and school education, the Home has either been overlooked or treated as an institution to be coddled rather than strengthened by its own right use.

THE FAMILY AND PROPERTY.

The close inter-relations of the Family and Property, their action and reaction upon each other, have been urged by us from the day of our organization. The history of legal institutions, the historic study of Economics, and the story of the rise of social institutions all show the importance of the institutions of the Family and Property to each other. Perhaps the most startling phase of the modern economic problem is seen when we contrast the corporate unity of the personality of early society and its material wealth through the household in one organization with the way in which personality and property are now being forced apart and into separate corporate associations with divergent interests. This movement of Property to the reduction of the direct personal, especially the Domestic interests in its management, to a minimum in our corporations for business purposes affects the Family profoundly. The modern corporation primarily serves a shareholder, and employs a laborer when it cannot put a machine in his place. It thus deals directly with individuals, with little regard for their social conditions. On the one hand the single man and woman, or the child, outbids in the labor market those who are

members of families, while on the other, all the members of the Family are pushed out of the Home into the mill except when restrained by legal and moral or social influences. Thus the Family is hard pressed. Its moral welfare and its individual interests tend to draw apart.

Then Property depends upon the Family for the industrial quality of its workmen, for their intelligence, honesty, and staying qualities. It depends upon the Home for the creation of those economic wants which spring out of growing intelligence, better taste, wider outlook, and higher ambitions. Property must look more and more to improved Home life for better laborers and larger demand for its productions. Labor, too, demands that better domestic morality among the rich which comes of their purer home life. Would it be far from the truth to say that, when we take an all-around view of the subject, a low domestic life imposes a heavier tax upon the material resources of the Nation than any other single cause? The Economist has immense interest in the Domestic problem. Mr. Edward Atkinson, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, when speaking before a legislative committee of the State in behalf of an economic measure, gave voice to this sentiment when he said: "Now, if there is any one element on which the future welfare and safety of this nation depends more than another, it is in maintaining the unit of the Family and in giving opportunity for the separate Home."

The study by statisticians of Family budgets of living expenses and Family earnings, instead of mere individual wages by the day or week, is bringing to light much that is valuable regarding the Family. The problem of the tenement-house is leading in the same direction.

THE FAMILY AND GOOD CITIZENSHIP.

From whichever point of view we may look at it, or from whichever party, the principles underlying recent political discussions run back into the fundamental subject of social morals. On all sides we have heard the demand for the protection of rights, for the consideration of various interests beyond those that are merely individual and selfish, and for honesty and justice. In some quarters, the vast importance of reverence for institutions and for law, the need of unselfish loyalty to the good of the whole, and the dangers of self-seeking, of ignorance, of playing with public interests for the sake of personal gain, have been set forth with great power.

There has been much that is commendable in all this; but, on the other hand, this work should be pressed home upon Church, School, and Family in these days, after the political excitement is over and greater calmness permits better study of the subject; for a study of social history will show, I think, that great national evils have their

roots in some defective condition of religious and domestic life. "When we arraign the public life as low and corrupt," says Mrs. Livermore, "we are making sad confession of the corruption of the private life and of the low moral standard of the Home, and to reform the public life the purification must begin at the hearthstone." This is sound sociological doctrine, and it is time that it should be recognized in all political discussions. The Home is the place in which to begin to cultivate those virtues of reverence for constituted authority, of the love of truth and righteousness, of honesty, self-denial, and devotion to high ideals, which make the foundations of society enduring, and whose lack brings all we hold dear into peril, and threatens the republic with discord and revolution. If rich men would put a tenth of the money they pay to save the country every four years into the improvment of the Home, if religious teachers who feel compelled to use their precious time to treat these great moral questions, as they call them, would guide those who hear them to give attention to the cultivation of the elements of the great political and social virtues in the Home, a better public conscience, a clearer political mind, and less disturbing political campaigns would follow. The relations of Capital and Labor would be vastly better. The Home can do far more for pure politics than the controversies of heated partisans.

THE HOME DEPARTMENT OF THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

There has been a great increase of interest in this use of the Home. More was done in 1896 to introduce it and make its merits known than in any former year. Its growth is now rapid. In September an estimate put the number of those in the Home Department of the Sunday Schools of the country at from 300,000 to 400,000 persons. In Connecticut one-quarter of all the Protestant churches have Home Departments, and one good authority expects to see a million added in this way to the Sunday Schools of the country within a very short time. Ten to fifty per cent of additions to the Sunday School, collected from the outlying districts, the aged, the sick and others, is a frequent experience. Some schools have hundreds in their Home Department. Its real significance, beyond the numbers and aid it brings to the Sunday School, is more appreciated than ever before. Its touch at the springs of domestic life, its awakening of parental responsibility, its aid to pastoral work, its suggestions of wider applications of its fundamental principle, that of calling upon the Home to do its own part in religious work, and its opening the eyes of the Church to its own duty to the Home, will increase the present great interest in this institution, which has a significance far beyond its use as a mere agency of the Sunday School.

Broader ranges of Bible study are now being planned for it, and successful experiments are going on to widen it in other directions. A leading Sunday-School publishing-house now has Lesson Helps especially adapted to the Home Department. The plan is really extremely simple; and the better insight that people are getting into its great simplicity is increasing the demand that its methods and apparatus be correspondingly few and simple.

Of course, the same danger exists here as in all social institutions. The invented institution is in danger, if not wisely managed, of bringing the more natural institution it would serve into bondage to the human invention. In other words, the Home Department may do what the Sunday School and even the Church itself have often done,—it may build itself up at the expense of the Home, while ostensibly putting the Home about its own work. This mere exploitation of the Home for sake of gain to other institutions is the old danger over again. The true spirit of the Home Department should easily prevent this; for its very idea is self-help within the Home, and as much as possible under parental direction. In these days of the wider outlook of Social Science this peril of exploiting the Home to serve another institution will be more readily checked.

THE HOME IN THE NEW EDUCATIONAL MOVEMENT.

Ten years ago, if not earlier, we pointed out the need of a closer connection between the Home and the Public School. Within the last year or two the subject has received attention among our Public School authorities. The town of Brookline, Mass., has introduced Domestic Science into its public schools. The work has been put in charge of Mrs. Alice Peloubet Norton, of Auburndale, who is doing excellent pioneer work in this field of the Home. Probably several of the cities and towns of Massachusetts are now making plans to secure a closer co-operation between the School and the Home by public meetings of parents and teachers to consider their common interests.

The increasing opinion that life itself is the greatest instrument of education, and the fact that, wherever possible, educational leaders look to its actual laboratories for a necessary part of their work, will inevitably turn popular attention more and more to the Home for its pedagogical value, both to children and adults, and that because so much of life centres in the Home. We shall begin to see, very likely, that the self-assertion of our American youth, growing out of our intenser egoism, with its lack of reverence, docility, and ready acceptance of the duties and obligations of the school, has much to do with making the age later at which the American boy is ready for college in this country as compared with the youth of Germany. If

this be so, we shall appeal to the Church, and through that to the Home as the greatest agent of the Church, for its correction. Habits of reverence, docility, openness to truth, candor, and prompt and full response to the appeals of the conscience and truth, with those powers of patient observation, careful discrimination, and sound judgment, and the right feelings, affections, and correct taste, which are the most precious blessings of a good education, are pre-eminently the achievements of a sound Home life. Church and School may inspire and inform; they may in a degree really mould the adult and the child; but the actual transformation of the work of Church and School into character — the most and the best which real education does, and its real object as regards the subjective end of education — is the work of actual life at Home and in society. "Make the School like the Home," exclaimed Froebel. "See that the Home does its own work," I would add. For his aim was to educate parent and child together.

The rapidly-increasing interest in child study and the incorporation of the kindergarten into the public-school system can hardly fail to accelerate this movement back to the Home; for the demand for the kindergarten rests largely on the recognized educational importance of the years immediately preceding the former school age. But child study is now pushing us still farther back. The years before the kindergarten age are seen to be immensely potent in education. The pre-natal life of the child, its ancestral inheritance, and all the supplementary life of the Home and the hours of play outside School, are coming into view as being full of educational meaning.

Fortunately the School cannot easily go farther into the Home. The limits of its work for the Home are happily nearly reached. And this is well because the Church and School will be compelled to throw the responsibility on the Home, where it belongs, and we shall go to work in earnest to set the Home about its own business, stimulating and training parents, instead of letting the Home become impoverished and weakened by constant dependence upon other institutions to make up its deficiencies. After a generation or two of misdirected effort, because not distributed among the several social institutions in due proportion, it is time to avail ourselves of the truths that Sociology and Psychology press upon our attention.

I may add that I find high educational authority in sympathy with this general opinion, and another year it is hoped that we can report some practical results from recent conference on the subject.

WOMEN AND THE HOME.

The past year has brought a decided increase of interest among women in the Home as a subject deserving their scientific and practical consideration. The late Mrs. Sarah Cooper led the women

of the Pacific Coast a year or two ago to hold a Woman's Congress in San Francisco, in which the entire meeting for a week was devoted to the Home. And now a Congress of Mothers is to be held in Washington February 17. This turning from an absorbing attention to Woman as an Individual, in her more public relations to Society, to those of her domestic life is very suggestive. If properly managed and kept free from needless antagonisms of other ways of promoting the interests of women, this new movement may render a very great service. The Woman's Club may be expected after a time to recognize more fully than at present the Family and Home as rich subjects for study and practical work.

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

By our own lectures and aid to their faculties who are guiding the studies of young men and women in our Higher Educational Institutions, and by correspondence with their students, who are constantly referred to us by their teachers for publications and suggestions, we are doing our usual work of this kind. Students now are often asked by their teachers to prepare papers on the Family and several of its special topics, when that is not offered as the subject of a course by itself, and sometimes to write reports on the work and history of the League. Wherever one of my own courses has been given in full or in large part, the interest of both faculty and students in tracing the outlines of the problem of the Family and its close and innumerable relations to the other great social questions has been extremely encouraging. The bearing of this kind of study upon a Sociology that is at once sound and practicable is becoming more apparent.

A course was given at Meadville, Pa., in the Theological School, and also, in part, in other places the past year. Of late I have had frequent calls to address clubs and churches on the various topics treated in our reports. The Modern Movement toward the Home; Our Problem of the Family; The Home in Religion and Education; The Home as a Factor in Social Reform; The Family and Property, have proved interesting and helpful popular themes.

THE GENERAL TREND OF WORK.

It is in connection with all these various lines of development that your Secretary has done the work of the year. Correspondence, personal conference, contributions to the press, public addresses and lectures, have touched all these topics in various ways. Most of them have been under consideration and treatment for several years; others are just coming into public notice; and yet all are likely to demand more and more attention as the years come and go. The details of such work, and the added burdens of our increasing debt, and the time

and strength consumed in the duties of collection, that should, if possible, be laid upon others, tax us very seriously. But the gains each year in the growing public interest in the various aspects of our American problem of the Family are highly encouraging.

THE BREADTH OF THE WORK AND OUR NAME.

The close inter-relation of these subjects and the growing apprehension in the public mind that they are all inseparable parts of the problem of the Family and the Home, and thus essential to the treatment of the social problems of the time, have justified our constitutional statement of the object of the League, noticed at the beginning of this Report. "The Family," as a social institution, is the inevitable subject that we reach if we treat Marriage or Divorce thoroughly; for these subjects relate to the formation and dissolution of the Family. The League is the first and only society wholly devoted to this fundamental institution in this comprehensive way. And surprising as it may seem, I believe Christianity, either among English-speaking peoples or in their inheritance from the early Christians, has never until within the last twenty years taken the Family as the chief point of view when looking at the subjects of Marriage, Divorce, and Chastity. Neither in the writings of the Early Fathers, nor in the Canon Law and other Ecclesiastical rules concerning these subjects, is their relation to the Family often so much as mentioned. As Milman said of celibacy and chastity in the Early Church, so it is true regarding Marriage and Divorce: The bearing of the subject on the individual was the consideration advanced; its influence on society and the Family was largely ignored or made incidental.

This change from the Individual to the Family is very near the pivot of the social problem of the times. This problem is to discover how we shall learn to take the results of modern Individualism and yet carry on the process of social reintegration. In other words, we are to deal less with mankind as an aggregation of Individuals, looking at every thing from the egoistic point of view, and learn to think of men in their social relations, thus perfecting Individuality by the development of Personality, which is the result of growth into the social whole. The life of the Family holds in it the key to this problem. Christianity has studied and used the Church and the State throughout its history. The time has now come when it needs to make equally thorough study and use of the Family. The recent movements in Biology, Psychology, Sociology, and Social Ethics emphasize these statements. Our ripest scholars have, therefore, all along recognized the timeliness of the formation of the League and the permanent value of its work.

The proposition, therefore, of the Executive Committee to consider

a change in the name of the League is a simple recognition of a popular demand and of the social movement in whose very centre our work necessarily lies. The only serious difficulty, apparently, will be in finding a sufficiently brief and expressive title that will distinguish us from other societies which have used the words that naturally describe our own work. It is hoped this difficulty can be successfully met. We may then confidently ask all to give us a place in their benevolences by the side of any other object.

The reader will see by the Treasurer's report and that of the Executive Committee that our debt has become uncomfortably large and that we need generous contributions immediately.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. DIKE,

Corresponding Secretary.

January 19, 1897.

Treasurer's Report.

WM. G. BENEDICT, *Treasurer*,
In account with the National Divorce Reform League.

Dr.			Cr.
	Dec. 31, 1896.		Dec. 31, 1896.
To Receipts from Contributions, 1896 . . .	\$2,118.99	By Disbursements at Various Times:—	
		Travelling Expenses . . .	\$165.40
		Printing	143.80
		Postage	70.05
		Advertising, Express, etc.	18.78
		Stationery	11.85
		Rent	50.00
		Paid on Account of Salary of S. W. Dike, LL.D., Secretary . .	1,659.11
			<u>\$2,118.99</u>
			MEMORANDUM.
		Due Dr. Dike Dec. 31, 1895	\$356.17
		Add Deficiency of 1896	341.89
		Due Dr. Dike Dec. 31, 1896	<u>\$698.06</u>
	<u>\$2,118.99</u>		

I have examined this Report and find the same correct.
W. B. HERRICK, *Auditor*.

Jan.	2.	Rev. W. H. Moore, Hartford, Ct.	\$ 3 00
	4.	Pres. Seth Low, LL.D., New York	50 00
	8.	Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia	20 00
	8.	Rollstone Cong. Church, Fitchburg	5 00
	11.	Messrs. Funk and Wagnalls, New York	10 00
	12.	Robert C. Ogden, Philadelphia	25 00
	12.	W. P. Henzy, Philadelphia	20 00
	12.	Mrs. Theodore D. Woolsey, New Haven, Ct.	50 00
	12.	Rev. S. P. Leeds, D.D., Hanover, N. H.	7 50
	12.	Rev. W. Spooner Smith, Auburndale	10 00
	18.	Rev. C. D. Bradlee, Brookline	5 00
	25.	State Street Cong. Church, Portland, Me.	25 00
		Received in January	<u>\$230 50</u>

Feb.	4.	St. John's Church, Washington, D. C.	\$ 15 00
	7.	J. N. Bacon, Newton	10 00
	8.	Hon. W. E. Dodge, New York	100 00
	8.	Pres. E. M. Gallandet, LL.D., Washington, D. C.	5 00
	8.	James C. Braman, Auburndale	10 00
	10.	Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D., Hartford, Ct.	25 00
	12.	Morris K. Jessup, New York	10 00
	12.	Pres. W. DeWitt Hyde, D.D., Brunswick, Me.	5 00
	14.	Rt. Rev. Arthur C. A. Hall, D.D., Burlington, Vt.	5 00
	14.	Rev. Wm. Prall, Ph.D., S.T.D., Detroit	3 00
	14.	Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D., Newton Centre	5 00
	14.	William G. Benedict, Brookline	25 00
	15.	Col. Jacob L. Greene, Hartford, Ct.	35 00
	15.	St. Ann's Church Miss. Society, Brooklyn	5 00
	17.	Rev. L. T. Chamberlain, D.D., New York	25 00
	18.	Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D.D., Cambridge	3 00
	19.	The Very Rev. E. A. Hoffman, D.D., N. Y.	25 00
	19.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester	5 00
	19.	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston	5 00
	19.	Rev. John W. Buckham, Salem	3 00
	20.	Rt. Rev. H. A. Neely, D.D., Portland, Me.	5 00
	22.	Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D.D., St. Louis	5 00
	25.	Alfred T. White, Brooklyn	10 00
	25.	Prof. W. M. Sloane, LL.D., Princeton, N. J.	5 00
	29.	Ephraim Whitman, Worcester	25 00
	29.	Prof. C. R. Henderson, Chicago	1 00
		Received in February	—————\$375 00

March	4.	Prof. C. H. Levermore, Ph.D., Brooklyn	\$ 5 00
	7.	Hon. Jonathan A. Lane, Boston	5 00
	7.	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale	5 00
	12.	Rev. Paul Van Dyke, D.D., Northampton	5 00
	16.	St. Bartholomew's Church, New York	100 00
	16.	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence	10 00
	17.	Rev. George U. Wenner, D.D., New York	1 00
	17.	J. N. Denison, Boston	25 00
	23.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston	25 00
	25.	Hon. Charles C. Burr, Auburndale	40 00
	31.	Stuart Wood, Philadelphia	10 00
		Received in March	—————\$231 00

April	2.	Prof. E. Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover	\$ 5 00
	2.	George P. Davis, Brookline	5 00
	3.	Church of the Incarnation, New York	50 00
	4.	William A. Knowlton, Auburndale	5 00
	6.	Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham	10 00
	6.	W. W. Lockwood, Detroit	5 00
	8.	W. F. Whittemore, Boston	5 00
	9.	John Nicholas Brown, Providence	25 00
	15.	Rev. George A. Putnam, Millbury	5 00
	15.	Charles A. Stott, Lowell	10 00
	23.	Robert H. Gardiner, Chestnut Hill	5 00
	24.	Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain	5 00
	25.	Rev. Henry Hopkins, D.D., Kansas City, Mo.	5 00

April 25.	George Burnham, Philadelphia	\$25 00
28.	Christ Church, Hartford, Ct.	10 00
30.	W. H. Catlin, Meriden, Ct.	1 00
	Received in April	———\$176 00

May 8.	Grace Church, New York	\$100 00
8.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester (in part)	25 00
9.	Rev. William S. Hazen, D.D., Northfield, Vt.	2 00
11.	Congregational Church, Quincy	13 55
13.	N. Noyes, Whitman	1 00
13.	Rev. Charles M. Southgate, Auburndale	5 00
13.	Mrs. John H. Mason, Providence	5 00
13.	Eugene W. Mason, Providence	5 00
15.	Mrs. Richard H. Dana, Jr., Cambridge	5 00
16.	Rev. Francis Goodwin, Hartford, Ct.	20 00
22.	Rev. A. Moss Merwin, Pasadena, Cal.	3 00
26.	Horace E. Scudder, Cambridge	5 00
27.	Charles E. Ranlet, Auburndale	5 00
30.	Trinity Church, Boston	50 00
	Received in May	———\$244 55

June 1.	J. L. Kilbon, Lee	\$ 3 00
1.	W. W. Eaton, Lee	5 00
4.	Christ Church, Fitchburg	12 67
4.	Rev. Henry Clay Trumbull, D.D., LL.D., Philadelphia	5 00
12.	George Ripley, Andover	10 00
16.	Hon. Edmund H. Bennett, LL.D., Boston	20 00
16.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, Boston	10 00
16.	Bible School, Cong. Church, Quincy	3 00
20.	Edwin Ginn, Winchester	10 00
20.	Rev. Howard A. Bridgman, Boston	3 00
20.	S. P. Wilkins, Newton Centre	2 00
	Received in June	———\$83 67

July 2.	Jacob Rogers, Lowell	\$10 00
6.	Rev. Leroy S. Bean, Portland, Me.	5 00
8.	George B. Knapp, Auburndale	10 00
10.	St. Ann's Church, Lowell	25 00
	Received in July	———\$50 00

Aug. 3.	J. Howard Nichols, Newton	\$5 00
---------	-------------------------------------	--------

Sept. 5.	"B. B.," New York	\$25 00
23.	Miss Elizabeth H. Houghton, Cambridge	25 00
24.	Rev. A. B. Bassett, Ware	5 00
25.	Rev. J. P. Bates, Brookline	10 00
26.	Rev. George M. Steele, D.D., Auburndale	5 00
26.	Samuel Johnson, Boston	10 00
	Received in September	———\$80 00

Oct. 6.	Rev. George M. Adams, D.D., Auburndale	\$5 00
7.	Old South Church, Boston	50 00
8.	Hon. Frederick J. Kingsbury, LL.D., Waterbury, Ct.	25 00

Oct.	9.	James S. Elton, Waterbury, Ct.	\$25 00
	9.	Prof. Alexander R. Merriam, Hartford, Ct.	5 00
	9.	Rev. John G. Davenport, D.D., Waterbury, Ct.	5 00
	9.	Nathan Mosman, Auburndale	2 00
	26.	Rev. Jn. H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10 00
		Received in October	—————\$127 00

Nov.	2.	Pres. Franklin Carter, LL.D., Williamstown	\$5 00
	5.	St. John's Church, Providence	25 00
	10.	Hon. John H. Washburn, New York	20 00
	7.	Prof. John Phelps Taylor, D.D., Andover	5 00
	8.	Mrs. W. E. Dodge, Sr., New York	10 00
	8.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, New Haven	50 00
	8.	Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, New Haven	10 00
	12.	William B. Herrick, Auburndale	10 00
	13.	Anson Phelps Stokes, New York	10 00
	17.	Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge	5 00
	17.	Hon. Lyman D. Brewster, Danbury, Ct.	5 00
	17.	Hon. Robert Treat Paine, Boston	5 00
	19.	Prof. G. D. B. Pepper, D.D., Waterville, Me.	1 00
	20.	"A Vermont lady"	50 00
	24.	Henry G. Marquand, New York	10 00
	24.	Rev. Horace Dutton, Auburndale	5 00
	25.	Mrs. Horace Fairbanks, St. Johnsbury, Vt.	10 00
	28.	E. R. Brown, Dover, N. H.	5 00
		Received in November	—————\$241 00

Dec.	4.	A. C. Tenney, Chelsea	\$2 00
	5.	Thomas Todd, Concord	5 00
	7.	Coolidge S. Roberts, Cambridge	20 00
	8.	William Endicott, Jr., Boston	5 00
	8.	Rev. W. W. Atterbury, D.D., New York	5 00
	9.	Rev. Daniel L. Furber, D.D., Newton Centre	2 00
	11.	Mrs. Maria Upham Drake, Boston	10 00
	14.	North Presbyterian Church, Allegheny, Pa.	18 27
	21.	Prof. George Harris, D.D., Andover	10 00
	22.	William S. Price, Philadelphia	5 00
	22.	St. Luke's Church, Philadelphia	25 00
	22.	Hon. Edward L. Pickard, Auburndale	20 00
	24.	E. P. Dutton, New York	10 00
	26.	Rev. T. T. Munger, D.D., New Haven, Ct.	5 00
	30.	Grace Church, Brooklyn	15 00
	30.	Rev. C. H. Spalding, Cambridge	10 00
	30.	South Congregational Church, New Britain, Ct.	10 00
	31.	Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale	3 00
	31.	Grace Church, New Bedford	25 00
	31.	First Church, Hartford, Ct.	25 00
	31.	John H. Converse, Philadelphia	25 00
	31.	Rev. Cecil F. P. Bancroft, LL.D., Andover	5 00
	31.	E. O. Fisk, Boston	5 00
	31.	Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston	5 00
	31.	Miss M. Josephine Allen, Boston	5 00
		Received in December	—————\$275 27

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National Divorce Reform League

ARTICLE I. This Association shall be called the NATIONAL DIVORCE REFORM LEAGUE.

ART. II. Its object shall be to promote an improvement in public sentiment and legislation in the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number.

ART. IV. The officers of this Society shall be a President, not more than five Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which Committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices; to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. THE LEAGUE shall hold its Annual Meeting on the first Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indicated in the call of the Committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two-thirds of the members present.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS concerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale, Mass.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer, WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, Esq., 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST.

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL DIVORCE REFORM LEAGUE, a Corporation created by the Laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successors or assigns, the sum of.....dollars, the principal [or income, as may be desired] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was chartered.

